



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/896,858	06/29/2001	Boris Gelfand	2127	9028

7590 03/04/2004

Beck & Tysver, P.L.L.C.
Suite 100
2900 Thomas Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55416-4477

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CINDY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2171

DATE MAILED: 03/04/2004

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

DM

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/896,858

Applicant(s)

GELFAND, BORIS

Examiner

Cindy Nguyen

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>8</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: |

DETAILED ACTION

This is in response to amendment filed 01/25/04.

1. *Information Disclosure Statement*

The information disclosure statement filed 01/25/04 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609. Because it has been placed in the application file, and the information referred to therein has been considered as to the merits.

2. *Response to Arguments*

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 9-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

New claims 21-23 are rejected below.

3. *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. *Claims 9-14 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Whitmore (U.S 6070165).*

Regarding claim 21, Whitmore discloses: a data store comprising a collection of data cells, the data store having no construct external to the cells that associates one cell with another

Art Unit: 2171

cell, each cell having an instance identifier, an entity identifier, an attribute type identifier and an attribute value (see fig. 4 and col. 9, lines 15-34, Whitmore).

Regarding claim 22, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 21 above. In addition, Whitmore discloses: wherein the collection of data cells further comprises: a first data cell containing a first attribute value for a first instance of a first entity type, the first attribute value being associated with the first attribute type (col. 9, lines 18-22, Whitmore); a second data cell containing a second attribute value for the first instance of the first entity type, the second attribute value being associated with a second attribute type (col. 9, lines 28-35, Whitmore).

Regarding claim 23, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 21 above. In addition, Whitmore discloses: wherein the collection of data cells further comprises: a first data cell containing a first attribute value for a first instance of a first entity type, the first attribute value being associated with the first attribute type (col. 9, lines 18-22, Whitmore); a second data cell containing a second attribute value for the second instance of the first entity type, (col. 7, lines 19-20, Whitmore); a third data cell containing a third attribute value for a first instance of a second entity type (col. 7, lines 21-25, Whitmore).

Regarding claim 9, Whitmore disclose: A method of establishing an association between a first data cell and a second data cell, with each data cell containing entity instance identifying information and a single attribute value for the entity instance (see fig. 4 and col. 9, lines 15-34, Whitmore), the method comprising:

a) creating a third data cell formatted in the same way as the first and second data cells (sName, fig. 7, Whitmore),

Art Unit: 2171

b) using the entity instance identifying information found in the first data cell as the entity instance identifying information of the third data cell (distributor, fig. 7 and corresponding text, Whitmore), and

c) using the entity instance identifying information of the second data cell as the attribute value for the third data cell (Contact, fig. 7, Whitmore).

Regarding claim 12, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 9 above. In addition, Whitmore discloses: further comprising the steps of: d) creating a fourth data cell formatted in the same way as the first, second, and third data cell (col. 8, lines 39-50, Whitmore);

e) using the entity instance identifying information found in the second data cell as the entity instance identifying information of the fourth data cell (col. 11, lines 53 to col. 12, lines 2, Whitmore), and

f) using the entity instance identifying information of the first data cell as the attribute value for the fourth data cell (col. 11, lines 53 to col. 12, lines 2, Whitmore).

Regarding claim 10, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 9 above. Whitmore discloses: wherein the first, second, and third data cells further contain entity type information, and further comprising the step of: d) using the entity type information of the first data cell as the entity type information of the third data cell (Distributor, sName in fig. 7 Whitmore).

Regarding claim 11, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 10 above. In addition, Whitmore/Williamson disclose: wherein the first, second, and third data cells further contain attribute type information, and further comprising the step of: e) using

Art Unit: 2171

the entity type information of the second data cell as the attribute type information of the third data cell (contact, sName in fig. 7, and fig. 2 and 4 Whitmore).

Regarding claim 13, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 12 above. In addition, Whitmore discloses: wherein the first, second, third, and fourth data cells further contain entity type information, and further comprising the step of: g) using the entity type information of the first data cell as the entity type information of the third. data cell (Distributor, sName in fig. 7 Whitmore); and h) using the entity type information of the second data cell as the entity type information of the fourth data cell (col. 9, lines 15-34, Whitmore).

Regarding claim 14, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 13 above. In addition, Whitmore/Williamson disclose: wherein the first, second, third, and fourth data cells further contain attribute type information, and further comprising the step of: i) using the entity type information of the second data cell as the attribute type information of the third data cell (contact, sName in fig. 7, and fig. 2 and 4 Whitmore); and j) using the entity type information of the first data cell as the attribute type information of the fourth data cell (470, fig. 4 and corresponding text, Williamson).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-8, 15-20 are allowed.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The prior art of record and that encountered while searching for the claimed invention fails to anticipate and/or suggest: a collection of data relating to multiple instances of multiple entity types the data collection comprising a plurality of data cells containing all of the data in the collection, with each cell being a data construct that contains a single element of data and each

Art Unit: 2171

cell contain a single instance identifier value identifying one specific instance of a specific entity type as recite in claim 1.

The prior art of record and that encountered while searching for the claimed invention fails to anticipate and/or suggest: a collection of data cells, wherein each cell contains a single element of data relating to a specific instance of an entity, the collection comprising the step c as recite in claim 15.

Regarding claims 2-8 and 16-20, these claims depend from claims 1 and 15 respectively and are therefore allowable.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

5. Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Lowry et al. (U.S 4864497). Method of integrating software application programs using an attributive data model database.

Handel et al. (U.S 6195651). System, method and article of manufacture for a tuned user application experience.

Gupta et al. (U.S 6154748). Method for visually mapping data between different record formats.

Art Unit: 2171

Carey et al. (U.S 6421658). Efficient implementation of typed view hierarchies for ORDBMS.

Gupta et al. (U.S 6438562). Parallel index maintenance.

Heubner et al. (U.S 6101502). Object model mapping and runtime engine for employing relational database with object oriented software.

6. Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cindy Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-4698. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7240 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.



Cindy Nguyen
March 1, 2004



WAYNE AMSBURY
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER